

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

9 \* \* \*

10  
11 WILLIAM J. WILKINS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 DOUGLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,  
15 et al.,

16 Defendants.  
17

Case No. 3:11-cv-00830-MMD-(VPC)

ORDER

(Magistrate's Report and  
Recommendation—Dkt. no. 8)

I. SUMMARY

Before this Court is the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (dkt. no. 8), entered by the Honorable Judge Cooke regarding Plaintiff's Complaint (dkt. no. 1-1). No objection was filed to Magistrate Judge Cooke's Report and Recommendation. This matter was referred to the undersigned for consideration.

The Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record in this case in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B)–(C) and Local Rule IB 3-2 and determines that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge should be accepted and adopted in part. The Court accepts and adopts the Report and Recommendation regarding Plaintiff's Count I claims. For reasons stated below, the Court modifies the recommendations regarding Plaintiff's Count II claims.

1           **II. MODIFICATIONS TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING**  
 2           **PLAINTIFF'S COUNT II CLAIMS**

3           In Count II, Plaintiff alleges a violation of the Eighth Amendment on the part of  
 4           Douglas County Sheriff's Office, Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center, and Carson  
 5           Tahoe Regional Medical Center Clinic (collectively, the "medical centers"), for failure to  
 6           treat his medical condition. As with Plaintiff's Count I claims, the Eighth Amendment is  
 7           inapplicable to Plaintiff's Count II claims because he was not a prison inmate under a  
 8           judgment of conviction at the time of the alleged events. As with those claims, and for  
 9           the same reasons (see dkt. no. 8 at 5-6), the Court construes Plaintiff's Count II  
 10          deliberate indifference claims as arising under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Due  
 11          Process Clause.

12           **A. Claims Against the Douglas County Sheriff's Office**

13           Plaintiff may assert a claim against the Sheriff's Office because it is a county  
 14          department. "[M]unicipal corporations and similar governmental entities" are juridical  
 15          persons who may be sued pursuant to § 1983. *Howlett By & Through Howlett v. Rose*,  
 16          496 U.S. 356, 376 (1990) (citing *Monell v. Dep't of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 663  
 17          (1978)). As noted at footnote 4 in the Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff has not  
 18          "alleged that a custom or policy caused the alleged constitutional violations which is  
 19          required for section 1983 claims against a municipality." (Dkt. no. 8 at 9, fn. 4) (citing  
 20          *Monell*, 436 U.S. at 694.) He must do so in order to assert a claim against a county  
 21          agency. See *Monell*, 436 U.S. at 694. Although the complaint fails to allege that a  
 22          custom or policy caused the constitutional violation, it is not obvious from the pleadings  
 23          that Plaintiff cannot assert such a claim. Therefore, Plaintiff may amend his complaint  
 24          accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

---

25  
 26           <sup>1</sup> Relatedly, as the Report and Recommendation states, Plaintiff's Count I claims  
 27          against Doe Defendants #1-6 in their official capacity are treated as a suit against the  
 28          entity. Those claims are therefore equivalent to the Count II claim against the Sheriff's  
             Office for the purposes of this Order. Should Plaintiff amend his complaint, he need not  
             (*fn. cont...*)

1           To the extent that Plaintiff attempts to bring state law claims against the Douglas  
 2 County Sheriff's Office, the claims are dismissed with prejudice for reasons stated in the  
 3 Report and Recommendation. (Dkt. no. 8 at 9.)

4           **B. Claims Against Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center and Carson**  
 5 **Tahoe Regional Medical Center Clinic**

6           Similarly, Plaintiff may amend his complaint against the medical centers.  
 7 Although Plaintiff's complaint contains several deficiencies regarding these claims,  
 8 because the deficiencies may be remedied, Plaintiff's complaint against the medical  
 9 centers is dismissed with leave to amend.

10          To state a viable § 1983 claim against the medical centers, Plaintiff must allege  
 11 that certain employees at the centers were acting under color of state law when the staff  
 12 denied him treatment. Notably, private hospitals and their staff may constitute state  
 13 actors under § 1983 in certain circumstances.<sup>2</sup> Part of establishing a cognizable claim  
 14 to that effect is demonstrating that the private hospital or medical staff-person contracted  
 15 with the jail facility to provide medical services to inmates. See *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S.  
 16 42, 53-54 (1988); *Lopez v. Dep't of Health Servs.*, 939 F.3d 881, 883 (9th Cir. 1991) (per  
 17 curiam)). If Plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, he should amend his  
 18 pleading to include such an allegation. Further, he must name the particular individual  
 19 defendants at the medical centers whom he alleges violated his constitutional rights.

20  
 21 \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 (...fn. cont.) allege a violation of a policy, custom, or practice on the part of Doe  
 23 Defendants #1-6 in their official capacity; the Sheriff's Office is the proper entity to name.

24          <sup>2</sup> Courts may hold that private entities or persons working for private entities are  
 25 acting under the color of state law under two theories. "Under the joint action test, a  
 26 private party acts under color of state law if he is a willful participant in joint action with  
 27 the State or its agents." *Lopez v. Dep't of Health Servs.*, 939 F.2d 881, 883 (9th Cir.  
 28 1991) (citations and quotation marks omitted). "Under the governmental nexus test, a  
 private party acts under color of state law if there is a sufficiently close nexus between  
 the State and the challenged action of the regulated entity so that the action of the latter  
 may be fairly treated as that of the State itself." *Id.*

1       **III. CONCLUSION**

2           Accordingly, it is ORDERED that: The Clerk shall file the complaint (dkt. no. 1-1);  
3  
4           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment due process  
5       claims for deliberate indifference ADVANCE as to Doe Defendants #1, #2, #3, and #5. If  
6       Plaintiff finds the identity of these Defendants, he shall file an amended complaint to add  
7       them as named defendants;

8           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following of Plaintiff's Count I claims are  
9       DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE for the reasoning articulated in the Report and  
10      Recommendation: (1) Official capacity suits against Defendants Does #1-6; (2)  
11      Deliberate indifference claims against Doe Defendants #3 and #6;

12           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's deliberate indifference Count II claims  
13       are DISMISSED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND;

14           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Count II Nevada state law claims are  
15       DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE;

16           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (dkt.  
17       no. 1-3) is DENIED;

18           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall send to Plaintiff a blank form for  
19       filing a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 with instructions and a copy of  
20       the original complaint. Plaintiff is advised that should he choose to file an amended  
21       complaint, it shall be complete in itself without reference to any previous complaint.  
22       Plaintiff is given sixty (60) days from the date of this order within which to file an  
23       amended complaint remedying, if possible, the defects in the complaint explained in this  
24       Order and in the Report and Recommendation. Any allegations, parties, or requests for  
25       relief from prior papers that are not carried forward in the amended complaint will no  
26       longer be before the Court. Plaintiff is cautioned that if he fails to file an amended  
27       complaint within the time period specified above, the action will proceed on the  
28       Complaint, and only with respect to those claims which the court has allowed to proceed.  
Plaintiff shall clearly title the amended complaint as such by placing the words "FIRST

1 AMENDED COMPLAINT" above the title "Civil Rights Complaint" on the form, and  
2 Plaintiff shall place the case number, 3:11-cv-00830-MMD-VPC, above the words  
3 "FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT" in the space for "Case No."

4 Finally, the Court notes that on May 24, 2012, Plaintiff improperly filed a first  
5 amended complaint without leave from the Court. The Court will not consider this filing.  
6 Should Plaintiff wish to file an amended complaint, he must do so as described in this  
7 Order.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 ENTERED THIS 12<sup>th</sup> day of June 2012.

10   
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28